DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 156 SP 031 308

AUTHOR Moore, Barbara McGregor
TITLE Descriptions of Induction Programs.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Mentors; *Program Effectiveness; *Social Support Groups; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Orientation; Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

Following a presentation of background information on studies about teacher induction in general, this paper describes four different teacher induction programs. All four programs used veteran teachers as support teachers for the beginners. These support teachers were referred to as mentors, helpers, coaches, and consultants. One of the goals of the first program was to improve beginning teachers' instructional performance by providing a more thorough first-year evaluation. Three full time consultants assisted and evaluated 47 first-year teachers. Regular observations and consultations were conducted and the consultants did both formative and summative evaluations. In the second program, the Assessment Program, three fulltime helping teachers met with 26 first year teachers at least once a week and observed, offered unofficial feedback, consulted and conferenced with them. They also provided demonstration lessons. In the Assistance Program, three mentor teachers were assigned to 30 beginning teachers. This program was less than successful because the mentors had only one day of released time each month and the beginning teachers were inclined to seek help from teachers more easily available. The fourth program, the Staff Development Program, had as its major goal credential training for 31 math and science teachers. The program offered the assistance of six coaches only to beginning teachers who requested one. Concerns of participants in these programs are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309156

DESCRIPTIONS OF INDUCTION PROGRAMS

Barbara McGregor Moore
Poway Unified School District
13626 Twin Peaks Road
Poway, California 92064
(619) 748-0010 x118

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California, March 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

5/05/1508

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Descriptions of Induction Programs

A few years ago teacher induction programs were hard to find. Since the professionalization of teaching has become a major element in school reform, we now find few districts that do not include some method of induction assistance for their new teachers. In fact, Huling-Austin (1986) calls it a "full-blown fad." However, these programs range from a "welcome breakfast" to fully developed instruction and evaluation models.

The purpose of this paper is to describe four very different teacher induction programs that address the professionalization of teaching in various ways as recommended by both the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Report (1986). First, background information on studies about induction in general is presented.

Teacher Induction

Researchers point out that beginning teachers worry about surviving on a day to day basis. Common problems encountered by beginning teachers are classroom management, planning and organization, evaluation of student work, motivation of students and adjustment to the teaching environment (Johnson & Ryan, 1983). New teachers are also concerned about finding materials, making students behave and dealing with parents (Odell, 1987).

One major goal of all induction programs is to help beginning teachers deal with these problems effectively so that

they will stay in teaching. The loss of potentially good teachers has been documented by Schlecty & Vance (1983) and others who report that over two thirds leave during the first four years of teaching.

Most researchers are in agreement with Feiman-Nemser (1983) that the first year of teaching is critical and often determines what kind of teacher the person will become. Teachers who do not have the support of an induction program question their effectiveness, doubt their abilities and lose self esteem more readily than others (Brooks, 1986; Hidalgo, 1986; Huffman & Leak, 1986; Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1987; Wildman, Niles, Magliarok, McLaughlin & Drill, 1987). When induction programs offer initial support and instruction, over 95% stay in teaching (Blackburn, 1977; Hegler & Dudley, 1987; Summers, 1987).

The various induction programs found across the country today have various purposes and many similar goals. Huling-Austin (1988) has provided a recent synthesis of research on induction programs and practices, and her framework identifies five of these goals.

Goal # 1: to improve teaching performance

Goal # 2: to increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years

Goal # 3: to promote personal and professional well being of beginning teachers

Goal # 4: to satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification

Goal # 5: to transmit the culture of the system to beginning teachers

This study and others stress the important role of the support teacher. "The assignment of an appropriate support teacher is likely to be the most powerful and cost-effective intervention in an induction program" (Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985: 50).

Support teachers are usually veteran teachers who provide assistance for beginners. The support teachers are the most helpful elements in many induction programs, and their experience in the classroom combined with their willingness to give time to the new teachers were positive influences. Additionally, having a support teacher who is qualified at the same grade level or subject matter was most effective. These studies (Hidalgo, 1986; Huffman & Leak, 1986; Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1987; Wildman et al, 1987) also indicated that support teachers generally gave more practical instruction on teaching performance than emotional support.

The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) conducted a three year study of the teacher induction process and made the following recommendations (among others):

1. Induction programs are necessary in every school district to assist beginning teachers in making a transition from novice to experienced professional. Induction programs must be based on the needs of the individuals as they adjust to their particular professional contexts.
2. Support teachers should be released substantially or fully from teaching.
3. Assistance should not be mixed with evaluation.

ATE reported that programs which have the most success in meeting beginning teacher needs are based on providing them with continuous information regarding the system, the teaching process and the profession. Beginning teachers should have release time for inservice and observation of other teachers, and support personnel should have limited loads so they have time to meet with beginning teachers both formally and informally (Brooks, 1987).

First year teachers reported that the role of the support teacher was very diversified. They offered assistance in being someone to talk/listen to, they located materials, they helped with clerical work related to district policies and procedures, lesson planning, classroom organization and discipline. Support teachers were MOST helpful in establishing realistic expectations. First year teachers reported that they made many changes as a result of the induction program and that it made them feel like professionals.

Additionally, support teachers need training in how to fulfill the role of support teacher and how to work in a supportive (adult) fashion. The district should make its expectations clear so they can balance their desire to be helpful with their desire to not be perceived as interferring.

Another important element of induction programs is the placement of beginning teachers. They are often given the worst assignments, and when they are teaching outside their subject areas or with difficult classes, the interventions of an induction program are not enough to overcome their placement

problems. When beginning teachers have a large number of preparations, demanding extra curricular responsibilities or large class sizes, they are most often unsuccessful. "It borders on the unprofessional to give the most difficult assignments to those least capable of handling them" (Wildman et al, 1987).

Among the many studies of induction programs, three are of particular interest to the issues of assistance and assessment.

In Connecticut's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program each beginning teacher had a mentor and an assessor. Mentors were to help the beginner teacher merge into the new role of teacher in a way that would reduce anxiety. Mentors were to help reduce the stress of the first year by assisting beginner teachers in learning about the school, by listening to beginner teacher's concerns and by helping the beginning teacher to articulate them. Assessors were to observe and focus on instructional behavior, but these assessments were not used to make any evaluative judgments. Both roles were to be "supportive", but almost twice as often the assessors were described as more helpful because of the detailed feedback on classroom activities that they provided.

The principals in this study reported a relief from evaluating all new teachers, but felt too distant from the beginning teacher or left out and confused about their roles. Many did not know what their role was supposed to be, and some felt they had no role at all in the project.

In a Los Angeles program, mentors were used to guide and assist new teachers, who were receiving their teacher training during their first year of actual teaching. Using a process of reflective analysis of teaching performance, the mentors tried to help them develop a conceptual framework for instructional performance. One recommendation of this study was that mentors function as university supervisors to help new teachers become independent learners who can link research to practice. In order to do this districts must provide release time and appropriate matches between mentors and beginners (Shulman, 1988).

Virginia's ~~colleague~~ teacher project (BTAP) focused on the beginning teacher's adaptation to teaching. Major concerns included "getting kids to cooperate", instruction, administrative tasks, and the workplace. Beginning teachers reported getting information, support and assistance from their experienced teacher which was very helpful. All beginner teachers reported more help from colleagues than any other source (Wildman, et al, 1987).

However, a commentary on Virginia's project reported that it was "all show". This "victim" stated that the program created an unbearable schedule. For a first year teacher all the observations "can be truly disconcerting, even destructive. As things stand now, first year teachers must perform like monkeys before the observers; mimicking the actions the observers want to see, instead of learning these actions as skills." (Education Week, 1988)

Obviously induction programs are not positive experiences for everyone. One of the goals of this study was to gain information on how to best assist beginning teachers in different settings.

Description of Programs

All four programs used veteran public school teachers as support teachers for the beginners. They were to provide assistance, encouragement, and information. These support teachers were referred to as mentors, helpers, coaches and consultants. Their roles in the different programs varied and the goals determined how the programs functioned.

Evaluation Program

One of the goals was to improve beginning teachers instructional performance by providing a more thorough first year evaluation. This program used a trust agreement between the teachers' federation and the school district, and it included a Toledo model of peer evaluation of beginning teachers. This was based on the teacher evaluation research of Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein (1984), and the trust agreement research of Charles Kerchner and Douglas Mitchell (1986).

Three full time consultants were used to assist and evaluate 47 first year teachers. These consultants began with a one day orientation before school started and then set up regular observations and consultations based on a clinical supervision model. They brought materials on a monthly basis, observed on a weekly basis, released new teachers for visits to

other teachers' classrooms and did demonstration lessons. They spent an average of eight hours a month with each new teacher. The consultants did both the formative and summative evaluations.

One of the new teachers was insistent that without his consultant he would not be returning to the classroom next year. Ed reported: "When I first found out about this program I was not thrilled. It was a hard year. I didn't have supplies, I didn't know where to get them, I couldn't control the class, but after Sharon (consultant) came on the scene I started to figure things out. She slapped those order forms out and shot them into the district office.

The very first visit, Sharon pointed out that I had 30 interuptions during a ten minute spelling test. I mean anybody can give a spelling test, yet I hadn't even noticed the number of interuptions.

At the beginning I thought it was a pain to have her there. It seemed like she was always watching me. But that made me look more critically at what I was doing and eventually I looked forward to her input. She would act out the lessons and show me what to do. She pointed out many things that helped me improve. I've learned a lot about teaching, and I think I'm going to be great!"

Sharon shared Ed's optimism and rated him as a superior teacher who had shown tremendous improvement. She stated that she thought he was below standard in the fall, but that he truly wanted to improve, and he did with each evaluation.

Assessment Program

Three full time helping teachers were assigned to 26 university interns on a scheduled basis. The district called the beginning teachers interns, but their roles were no different from other beginning teachers except for the fact that they still had support from their university student teaching programs also.

The helping teachers were "officially" released full time for the induction program, but in reality they were called on to do various staff development activities for the entire district so that they actually worked less than full time with the beginning teachers. They emphasized reflective teaching and emotional support on a regular basis. They met with the beginning teachers at least once a week and observed, offered unofficial feedback, consulted and conferenced with them. They also provided demonstration lessons and took over the class in order to provide release time for the beginners to observe other teachers. The average amount of time spent with the beginners was four hours a month. Reflective analysis of teaching performance was the major goal of this program.

One of the new teachers in this program reported: "Donna (helping teacher) has really been a lot of help. She's given me lots of ideas and made me aware of many different teaching strategies, but I am sick of hearing 'How do you think it went?' I wish she would just say, 'That was great,' or 'That was crummy,' and just tell me what she wants me to do.

This teacher was torn between the assistance she

received from Donna, the helping teacher, and the guidelines set by her principal. "She encouraged me to keep trying cooperative learning, but the principal gave me an unsat on class control because it's too noisy. She was good at making me evaluate my actions, but he (the principal) was more direct and just told me to keep them quiet. So I quit cooperative learning, and he was happy, but Donna wasn't. I guess he thought I was OK in everything else because he's asked me to stay on next year."

Assistance Program

The major goal of the assistance program was to "help them get started." None of these participants had previous experience in their roles. Three mentor teachers were assigned to 30 beginning teachers. The mentors were released from their classroom duties on a part time basis to offer assistance. The beginning teachers had no previous classroom teaching experience other than student teaching. The mentors met with them before the start of the school year and called them once a month during the fall semester. They answered questions, provided encouragement and made plans to get together. However, only 19 of the beginning teachers actually met with the mentors during the school year, and the calls became infrequent during the spring semester. The mentors had only one day of release time each month and felt that once the beginners got "their feet on the ground" they were not needed. The average time spent in assisting the new teachers was less than one hour a month during the fall semester and less than 30

minutes a month during the spring semester.

The mentors often felt they were neglecting their own classrooms to go an visit the beginning teachers. The beginners realized this and were hesitant to ask for help. Instead they usually relied on other grade level teachers at their own sites for help on an informal basis.

A typical case was reported by Susan: "I really like my mentor, and I know I can call on her anytime, but it's silly for her to come over here and help me figure out the report card when Sylvia is right next door, and she always asks me if I have any questions. I talk to Sylvia every day anyway. She's the one who took me around the school and showed me how to fill out all the forms. The mentor just wants to know if I have any problems, and because of Sylvia I really don't. Except for this one little boy who won't cooperate, but Sylvia said nobody has ever been able to work with him so just ignore it. If it weren't for her I'd have knocked my head against the wall for nothing." The school principal was concerned about the children Susan chose to ignore, and he thought she needed more assistance than he was able to offer. Nevertheless, he gave her satisfactory evaluations, and she returned in the fall.

Staff Development Program

District staff development was required for 31 first year teachers who had no formal teacher training, and six coaches were available when requested. The major goal of the program was to provide credential training for math and science

teachers on the secondary level.

The beginners were a mature group (average age - 38) and many were in the process of a career change. These new teachers had been given a summer inservice, and they met one night a week and one weekend a month for their credential training throughout their first year. College coursework was offered jointly by a local university and the district.

The staff development program also provided coaches to offer assistance only when requested. The coaches were supposed to visit and offer advice on instruction, but only two of the four who were interviewed actually went into the teachers' classroom. These two spent an average of one hour a month with the new teachers. Another coach reported, "Well, nobody ever called me, so I guess they're doing OK."

Bob offered these comments: "Everybody at school has been very helpful. People in my department loan me materials, and the coach gives me lots of encouragement, but I don't feel like I'm getting across to the kids. I can't get them to do any homework, and they just fool around when we're doing experiments.

Our coursework is a joke. Every Tuesday night I sit there and listen to people who haven't been in a classroom for years. We're supposed to study something called pedagogy, but I wish we'd learn more about how to teach. Other teachers have told me you only learn through experience anyway.

The coach comes in and says don't worry. Everything is fine. The principal comes in and says, 'good job'. But I know

I don't know what I'm doing, and I know the kids know it too. Now I do know Chemistry, but I don't know how to teach it. I'm getting my credential, and I'll try one more year, but I sure hope I'll get better."

Summary

Descriptions of the four programs are summarized in Table 1. Major differences include the types of communities and titles for the support teacher. Two programs were "full" time, and two were part time. Two made the induction program mandatory. The programs also differed in the type of support offered and in their goals.

Table 1 - Summary of Four Program Descriptions

Model	Evaluation	Assessment	Assistance	Staff Dev.
Community	Affluent Sub	Middle Sub	Middle Sub	Inner City
Support Teacher	Consultant	Helping T	Mentor T	Coach
Full Time/Part Time	FT	FT*	PT	PT
Required/Available	Req.	Req.	Available	Available
Time Spent/month	8 hrs	4 hrs	1 hr - 30 min	1 hr - 30 min
Type of Support	Evaluation	Reflection	Emotional	Advice
Goal of Program	Performance	Performance	Retention	Retention

*In actual practice, these teachers did not work full time on the induction program.

Method and Results

Data was collected through surveys and interviews during May and June of 1988. Surveys were sent to all administrators who had beginning teachers at their schools and to a random selection of experienced teachers at these schools.

Interviews were attempted with all support teachers and beginning teachers in the induction programs. This resulted in 143 surveys and 126 interviews or 269 responses from the 353 participants and a 75% response rate (Table 2).

Evaluation Model: All three consultants and 39 beginning teachers were interviewed. Fourteen administrators and 43 experienced teachers responded to surveys.

Assessment Model: All three helping teachers and 22 beginning teachers were interviewed. Eight administrators and 19 experienced teachers responded to surveys.

Assistance Model: All three mentors and 27 beginning teachers were interviewed. Ten administrators and 20 randomly selected experienced teachers returned survey questionnaires.

Staff Development Model: Four out of six coaches and 25 beginning teachers were interviewed. Seven administrators and 22 experienced teachers returned surveys.

The surveys consisted of ten open ended questions concerning the participants' roles in induction programs and their perceptions of the effectiveness of current practices. The interviews were semi-structured, from thirty to ninety minutes long and designed to elicit responses concerning first year experiences and the effects of the induction program. Results from the interviews were also used to develop case studies for selected support teachers and beginning teachers.

TABLE 2

Survey and Interview responses

	EVAL			ASSESS			ASST			STAFF			TOTAL
	N	#	%	N	#	%	N	#	%	N	#	%	N
Support T	3	3	100	3	3	100	3	3	100	4	6	67	13
New T	47	39	83	26	22	85	30	27	90	31	25	81	113
Adm	18	14	78	13	8	62	16	10	63	12	7	58	39
Exp T	60	43	72	26	19	73	30	20	67	31	22	71	104
Total	128	99	77	68	52	76	79	60	76	78	61	78	269

(T=Teacher, Adm=Administration, Exp=Experienced)

Only a few questions from the surveys and interviews will be discussed in this paper. First, "Do you favor this type of induction?" was asked of all participants. Table 3 shows a summary of beginning teacher responses compared to all participants (support teachers, administrators, experienced teachers), and Table 4 gives more details.

TABLE 3 Summary

Do you favor this method of induction?

	Beginning teachers			Total Participants		
	N	#Yes	%	N	#Yes	%
evaluation	39	35	90	99	36	84
assessment	22	17	77	52	41	79
assistance	27	19	70	60	44	75
staff development	25	14	56	58	36	62

TABLE 4

Do you favor this method of induction?

	YES			SOMEWHAT			DON'T KNOW			NO		
	N	#	%	N	#	%	N	#	%	N	#	%
EVAL MODEL												
Support T	3	3	100									
New T	39	35	90							39	4	10
Adm	14	12	79	14	1	7				14	1	7
Exp T	43	32	74	43	4	9	43	2	5	43	5	12
ASSESS MODEL												
Support T	3	3	100									
New T	22	17	77	2	22	9	22	1	5	22	2	9
Adm	8	6	75	8	2	25						
Exp T	19	15	79	19	2	11	19	1	5			
ASSIST MODEL												
Support T	3	3	100									
New T	27	19	70	27	3	11	27	3	11	27	2	7
Adm	10	7	70	10	1	10				10	2	20
Exp T	20	15	75	20	2	10	20	2	10	20	1	5
STAFF DEV MODEL												
Support T	4	3	75							4	1	25
New T	25	14	56	25	2	8	25	1	4	25	8	32
Adm	7	4	57	7	1	14	7	1	14	7	1	14
Exp T	22	15	68	22	4	18	22	2	9	22	1	5

All programs were rated favorable by over half the respondents. The beginning teachers' ratings ranged from 90% in favor of the evaluation model to 56% in favor of the staff development model. The evaluation model also received the highest percentage of

positive responses (84%), and the staff development model was the least favorable (62%).

Beginning Teachers Questions

TABLE 5

Who or what has been most helpful during your first year?

	Eval. N=39		Assess. N=22		Assist. N=27		Staff N=25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Support Teacher	32	82	16	73	16	59	9	36
Other Teacher	3	8	4	18	8	30	13	52
Misc. (Adm, Inservice)	4	10	2	9	3	11	3	12

The majority of beginning teachers found the support teacher to be most helpful in every program except the staff development model. Here other teachers were described as most helpful by 52% of the beginners.

TABLE 6

What was the one major concern you dealt with most often during your first year?

	Eval. N=39		Assess. N=22		Assist. N=27		Staff N=25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Supplies	8	21	2	9	3	11	2	8
Discipline	7	18	3	14	6	22	6	24
Time	6	15	3	14	5	19	9	36
Administrators	3	8	5	23	6	22	3	12
Instruction	15	38	9	41	7	26	5	20

New teachers listed supplies, discipline, time, administrators and instruction as provoking worry, stress, effort and concern. A higher percentage of the beginning teachers in the assessment model found instruction to be their main concern. Time was a problem in the staff development model, and administrators were of little concern in the evaluation model since they had little contact with them. Compared to the fall surveys and interviews, all priorities had changed. At that time all beginning teachers major concern fell into either the supply or discipline categories. Also, new teachers in the evaluation model were more apprehensive about the evaluation process than those in other models in the fall.

TABLE 7
How would you rate your evaluation process?

	Eval. N=39		Assess. N=22		Assist. N=27		Staff N=25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Helpful	20	51	5	23	6	22	5	20
Fair	16	41	5	23	6	22	7	28
Perfunctory	0	0	7	32	8	30	10	40
Poor	3	8	5	23	7	26	3	12

Glowing descriptions were lumped into the helpful category, while fair included OK, no problem, and no big deal. A majority (51%) of the teachers in the evaluation model found their evaluations helpful, while the greatest number of teachers in the other models described the process as perfunctory (including "superficial" and "joke".)

TABLE 8
What do you think about the overall benefits of the induction program?

	Eval. N=39		Assess. N=22		Assist. N=27		Staff N=25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Very beneficial	23	59	13	59	12	44	8	32
Helpful	12	32	5	23	7	26	8	32
OK	0	0	2	9	4	15	4	16
Not helpful	4	10	2	9	4	15	5	20

The majority of beginning teachers found both the evaluation and assessment models to be very beneficial. In fact, teachers in the evaluation program rated it definitely either helpful or not. Those in the assistance and staff development models were more divided.

TABLE 9
What are your plans for next year?

	Eval. N=39		Assess. N=22		Assist. N=27		Staff N=25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Return to District	35	85	18	82	20	74	16	60
Leave Teaching	4	10	3	14	4	15	9	36
Move to Another Dis.	2	5	1	5	3	11	1	4

The highest percentage of those beginners who planned to leave teaching were found in the staff development model. Reasons for leaving included "contract not renewed", "teaching's not for me", "teaching is too hard", "teaching is not as rewarding as I expected", and "I'm no good at it."

Support Teachers

Three of the questions that support teachers were asked are reported as follows:

How would you rate your effectiveness in helping beginning teachers?

What were the best aspects of this induction program for you?

What was the worst part of the program from your perspective?

The consultants reached a consensus on their effectiveness and reported that they "got all but four new teachers up to the district standards" so they felt very effective. They found the most rewarding part of their work was seeing new teachers act on their suggestions. The worst time of the year was when they had to give unsatisfactory evaluations. These teachers worked very closely together and shared opinions on each question.

The helping teachers in the assessment model also felt effective in making teachers evaluate their own instruction. One of them said, "It made me feel real professional to work with the new teachers." They experienced a feeling of accomplishment when they were able to achieve their goals (reflective analysis of teaching performance) but found the experience emotionally "draining". Two of them had conflicts with the principals.

The mentors and assistants differed, with some in each category: very effective, somewhat effective and not effective. They reported "being helpful" as the best part of the program, and mentors thought it took them away from their own classrooms too much. Mentors were also unhappy about traveling to too many schools and not having enough time to do a proper job. The coaches who tried to participate fully in assisting the beginners were frustrated by "getting them to invite me into their classrooms."

The majority of mentors and coaches felt ineffective, but the other support teachers did not.

Administrators and Experienced Teachers

Three of the questions asked of administrators and experienced teachers were:

How would you rate the support teachers?

What are the best aspects of the program?

What are the problems with the program?

School principals in the evaluation program rated the consultants as "outstanding" in the majority of cases (86%). One reported, "These consultants are practical and professional, highly qualified and they have enormous expertise. They establish personal, caring relationships with beginning teachers which are not possible for a site administrator." Nevertheless, they wanted to work more closely with the beginning teachers, while at the same time they were relieved to have a lighter load of evaluation duties.

In the assessment program, principals were divided between "excellent" evaluations of the support teachers and "difficult to work with". The best part of the induction program, from their point of view, was that the beginning teachers had more help. "(Helping teachers) made the new teachers think about what they were doing. Sometimes new teachers are so busy doing that they don't stop to think about what's effective." Criticisms included, "takes too much time" and differences of opinion on what new teachers needed most.

Mentors received mixed ratings with the majority of principals (60%) saying they were helpful and effective in getting new teachers started. The principals also had concerns

about the amount of time mentors spent out of their own classrooms, and felt hesitant to let them help at other schools.

In the staff development program, 43% of the principals didn't know what the coaches were doing, and 28% felt that the program was generally ineffective. In other cases they praised the coaches and stated that they were doing a good job of helping the new teachers. The first priority of these administrators was to retain the teachers, and many were very uncritical of their performance.

In general, administrators were in favor of each program. However, many were unsure of their roles when evaluation of beginning teachers was included even though they appreciated a lighter load of evaluation duties. There were often disagreements between principals and the helping teachers, and most administrators wanted the helping teachers to be more directive. More principals in the assistance and staff development models were not convinced that the programs were effective.

Experienced Teachers

In all models the experienced teachers were unaware or poorly informed about the induction program. Those who wanted to help the new teachers felt somewhat left out, others were somewhat relieved that the new teachers wouldn't detract from their own planning and preparation, and some were jealous of the support teachers' new roles. Others saw consultants and helping teachers as administrators rather than peers.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Each group of respondents (beginning teachers, support teachers, administrators and experienced teachers) had different concerns about the induction programs. In the assistance model, mentors and beginning teachers were most concerned about the amount of time spent together, in the reflective model, they worried about classroom management, in the staff development model, the major concern was overload, and in the evaluation model, it was about rigid demands. However, when the actual practice of all four programs was examined, the evaluation and assessement models were rated as the most effective by the beginning teachers.

Beginning teachers often did not take mentors or coaches seriously and were hesitant to ask for help. When the induction program was informal and not required, many new teachers did not take advantage of the assistance. Most beginning teachers reported "learning" more in the assessment and evaluation models.

All programs were successful to some extent in reaching their goals of providing assistance to new teachers. In addition, the assessment model also hoped to encourage a reflective approach to instruction, the staff development program wanted to provide credential training, and the evaluation model intended to improve the first year evaluation process.

Evaluation

Out of the 47 in the program, 4 were not offered contracts for the following year due to poor evaluations, but all those who "survived" intended to make teaching a career. Nearly 90% of the new teachers reported this program as beneficial, but 10% of the new teachers found the consultants to be too critical and were unhappy with the program. This program encouraged a district approved clinical teaching model, and there was little room for deviation. Nevertheless, most new teachers offered high praise of their consultants and were happy with the program at the end of the school year. New teachers most often mentioned that the consultants "pointed out things I was unaware of." 84% of all participants favored this method of induction and pointed to the "professional quality of the consultants" as the reason for its success.

Assessment

While 9% of the new teachers did not appreciate the "interference of the helping teacher", 82% found this to be very beneficial. Many new teachers reported that the process took a long time, and others felt conflict between the helping teachers and the principals. Of the 22 interviews, 19 indicated that they would return to teaching in the fall. One was quitting because of poor evaluations, and two found teaching to be an "impossible job." Those who planned to return praised the helping teachers for their assistance in examining their instructional performance. 79% of all participants favored this method of induction, and two changes

were made in the program. First the helping teachers were relieved of other district responsibilities, and second, the principals were given inservice training on reflective teaching.

Assistance

The majority of new teachers (82%) in the assistance model found their program to be helpful, but 14% of them decided to leave teaching. A few of those leaving stated that administrators treated them "like children". The support teachers were appreciated in most cases, but the logistics of time and place prevented many of them from providing as much assistance as they would have preferred. The new teachers in this program found the most support in the beginning of the year with assistance directed toward acquainting them with the district and their schools and helping them locate materials. 75% of all participants favored this method of induction, and plans were made to have a mentor at each school and to increase their release time.

Staff Development

When the coaches did observations and suggested improvements, most new teachers (64%) found it helpful. However, nine of them (36%) did not intend to stay in teaching. They felt unprepared, overworked and overwhelmed. Five of these teachers were hired after school has started, and they never quite caught up. Many new teachers thought too much was expected of them during their first year. They did not find their coursework helpful, and some of them said this was

because they were too tired to pay attention after teaching all day. Others described the courses as unrealistic and impractical. Although 62% of all participants favored this method of induction, the program was eliminated.

Learning to teach effectively is a complex process that takes many years, but the experiences of first year teachers may determine what kind of teachers they become and whether or not they stay in teaching. The beginning teachers in this study wanted to improve their instructional performance in most cases and found it more difficult to do without observations and feedback. This entailed many hours, and most programs did not have sufficient time. The only true full time support teachers were found in the evaluation model. When evaluation or assessment was part of the induction support, the beginning teachers were more satisfied and more successful. This may have been a result of the number of hours spent with their support teachers.

More research is needed on different induction programs which operate under similar circumstances. It is difficult to compare these programs since they serve diverse student populations and have different goals. For example, the goal of the evaluation model was to provide a more thorough first year evaluation. One of the consultants in the evaluation model offered the following assistance to an unsuccessful teacher:

10 formal observations

12 informal observations (two were all day visits)

23 conferences

3 release days to observe other teachers

2 release days to attend inservice training

This teacher had an average class in an affluent neighborhood, was hired in August and had no extracurricular assignments. Although his contract was not renewed, he intends to try another district.

This is in comparison to the staff development model which aimed to provide credential training and retain promising beginners. One of their successful teachers who taught in the inner city and who was hired late, actually had no induction assistance because her coach never showed up. Yet she was determined to be a teacher, and is still "on her own".

Further study of new teachers and their adaptation to teaching could add to our information about how knowledge, skills and attitudes are acquired and help to refine future induction practices. The pros and cons of mixing evaluation with assistance have been described, and some recommendations for all induction programs are offered:

Hire beginning teachers as far in advance as possible. Give them access to their classroms and make sure they are well stocked with supplies.

Place new teachers in reasonable assignments, where they are qualified and do not assign extra duties until they have become acquainted with the school.

Place support teachers in the same building, same subject and at the same grade level when possible.

Require support teachers to visit new teachers (not

merely be "available.")

Provide adequate time for support teachers to do an effective job. When they have other responsibilities, new teachers do not receive adequate assistance.

Train support teachers in giving feedback on instructional performance (whether official evaluations or informal) as well as providing assistance and encouragement.

When new teachers receive support and direction during their critical first year, they more quickly become accustomed to district expectations, develop useful teaching strategies, and they hold promise for more effective instruction. However, just having an induction program does not insure that beginners receive any meaningful guidance, and the personal motivation and previous experience of new teachers may be more powerful than their experience in an induction program. Nevertheless, in the current climate of school reform, the induction "fad" seems necessary and beneficial.

References

Blackburn, J. (1977). The first year teacher: Perceived needs, intervention strategies and results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Brooks, D. (1987). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, (1986). New York.

Collins, M. (1987). Time to become a professional teacher. Education Week. June 17. Vol. 6; No. 38.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman, Inc.

Hegler, K. & Dudley, R. (1986). Beginning teacher induction: A progress report. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (1), 53-56.

Hidalgo, F. (1986-87). The evolving concerns of first year junior high school teachers in difficult settings: Three case studies. Action in teacher Education, 8 (4), 75-79.

Holmes Group, (1986). Lansing, Michigan.

Huffman, G. & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (91), 22-25.

Huling-Austin, L. & Murphy, D. (1987). Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., Edwards, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). MTIP Satellite Conference proceedings. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot be reasonably expected from teacher induction programs. Teacher Education. 37 (1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1988). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Johnston, J., & Ryan, K. (1983). Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.) The education of teachers: A look ahead. (pp. 136-162). New York: Longman.

Kerchner, C. & Mitchell, D. (1986). Teaching reform and union reform. Elementary School Journal. 86 (4), 449-469.

Odell, S. (1987). Teacher induction: Rationale and issues. Teacher Induction: A New Beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Schlecty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 468-487.

Shulman, J. (1988). Blue Freeways: Traveling the alternate route with big-city teacher trainees. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Summers, J. (1987). Summative evaluation report: Project CREDIT. Terre Haute: Indiana State University, School of Education.

Wildman, T., Niles, J., Magliaro, S., McLaughlin, R., & Drill, L. (1987). Virginia's colleague teacher project: Focus on Beginning Teachers' adaptation to teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher Evaluation. A Study of effective practices. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.